UR-1388 ER40685-837

Poisson Algebra of Wilson Loops in Four–dimensional Yang–Mills Theory

S. G. Rajeev and O.T. Turgut

Department of Physics and Astronomy
University of Rochester
Rochester, N.Y. 14627
e-mail: rajeev and turgut@urhep.pas.rochester.edu

arXiv:hep-th/9410053v1 7 Oct 1994

Abstract

We formulate the canonical structure of Yang–Mills theory in terms of Poisson brackets of gauge invariant observables analogous to Wilson loops. This algebra is non–trivial and tractable in a light–cone formulation. For $U(N)$ gauge theories the result is a Lie algebra while for $SU(N)$ gauge theories it is a quadratic algebra. We also study the identities satsfied by the gauge invariant observables. We suggest that the phase space of a Yang–Mills theory is a co–adjoint orbit of our Poisson algebra; some partial results in this direction are obtained.

1. Introduction

A central problem in present day particle physics is to find a formulation of Yang–Mills theories in terms of manifestly gauge invariant variables. This problem was tackled first by Mandelstam [1]. It is even more important to solve this problem now since there is strong experimental evidence that in an unbroken gauge theory (Quantum ChromoDynamics, QCD) all observable states (hadrons) are gauge invariant. Thus a theory of hadrons would be such a reformulation of QCD in terms of gauge invariant variables. This problem has been solved in two dimensions, for pure gauge theory, [2] for gauge theory coupled to non–relativistic matter [3], [4], and coupled to Dirac fermions [5], [6], [7] (For related work, see [8], [9].) In all these cases it was possible to cast the canonical formalism of the theory in manisfestly gauge invariant form by an appropriate choice of variables.

Often the resulting phase space has little resemblance to the original one. In the case of two dimensional QCD, the phase space of the gauge invariant formalism is a Grassmannian. The dynamical variable is a function of two points of space–time (which lie on a null line), $M(x, y)$ .This variable must satisfy a quadratic constraint. (The set of such 'matrices' satisfying this quadratic constraint is a coset space of the Unitary group, the Grassmannian.) The Poisson brackets of this variable follow from the natural symplectic structure of the Grassmannian. The hamiltonian is a quadratic function of $M(x, y)$. These results were originally derived by rewriting the large N_c limit of two dimensional QCD as a classical dynamical system [5]. In two dimensional QCD, $M(x, y)$ has the meaning of a quark bilinear. The theory of the variable $M(x, y)$ is thus a theory of hadrons: mesons are the small oscilations around the vacuum and baryons are the solitons [6]. It was even possible to reverse the whole argument and derive two dimensional QCD as the quantization of the hadron theory. A similar formulation of QCD of systems with spherical symmetry has also been possible [10].

A similar hadron theory in four dimensions is not yet possible. In this paper we take some steps in that direction: in some sense the 'kinematical' part of the problem is solved. The idea was outlined earlier in ref. [5]. Following the strategy that worked in two dimensional QCD, we first find the canonical commutation relations of a set of gauge invariant variables. The natural choice for gauge invariant variables are the Wilson loops, the trace of the parallel transport operators around closed loops.(There is a large amount of work on the loop formulation of gauge theories. A partial list is Ref. [1], [11], [12], [13], [14], [15].) In the usual canonical formalism, these variables will have a trivial Poisson algebra if the loops lies on a space–like initial value surface: the spatial components of the connection are the 'position' variables of the Yang–Mills phase space. To encode the canonical information, we must introduce some gauge invariant 'strip' variables from the electric field [14].

We find it more natural, and more analogous to the approach in two dimensions to prescribe initial data on a null surface. Then we can eliminate the non–propagating, time like, component of the connection explicitly. (Light–frame formulation of QCD has attracted much attention recently for independent reasons [16].) Moreover, the spatial components are canonically conjugate to each other. The Wilson loops on the null surface have non–trivial Poisson brackets and completely encode the canonical information of the Yang–Mills phase space. In fact the algebra so obtained is quite elegant; it has a simple description in terms of the geometry of the loops. It is a Lie algebra in the case where the underlying gauge group is $U(N_c)$. [5]. In the realistic case of an $SU(N_c)$ gauge theory, it is a quadratic algebra. We believe it is the first time that such a quadratic algebra has emerged in a physically relevant theory. (The Wilson loops of QCD will satisfy this quadratic algebra.) The algebra has a particularly simple form for smooth loops in a *four–dimensional* gauge theories; it is not well–defined for dimensions higher than four and is somewhat more complicated in dimension three.

In the case of two dimensional QCD, the phase space of the hadron theory was a co–adjoint orbit of the Poisson algebra of observables. We conjecture that the Phase–space of a four dimensional Yang–Mills theory is a co–adjoint orbit of our Poisson algebra. The quantum analogue of this statement is that different Yang–Mills theories correspond to different representations (or deformations) of the same underlying Poisson algebra. We are able to show this for the simplest case of $U(1)$ gauge group. In this case the Yang–Mills phase space is given by a quadratic constraint (Mandelstam constraint) on the Wilson loop variable. In more complicated cases the Yang–Mills phase space is given by more complicated Mandelstam constraints; we will see that these are invariant subspaces of the Poisson algebra. We have not shown that the action of the Poisson algebra is transitive, but we believe this to be the case.

The conformal invariance of four dimensional Yang–Mills theory allows us to map the problem to the conformal completion of Minkowski space; then every loop must pass through the point representing past infinity, which makes it more convenient to state the Mandelstam constraints.

It is of much interest to understand the representation theory and the automorphisms of our algebras. Also, the algebra might possess interesting quantum deformations in the sense of Drinfeld [17]. This should help in developing the classical ideas of this paper into the quantum regime. Just as two dimensional hadron theory is a field theory of open strings, the algebra we describe here should be the basis of a four dimensional closed string field theories. It is not nilpotent unlike the light–cone string field algebra of conventional string theories which are just canonical commutation relations [18]. Some of the nonlinearities of the theory are contained in the Poisson algebra, just as in two dimensional hadrondynamics. We hope that the string field theoretical aspects of the subject will be investigated further in the future.

We first give a canonical formulation of Yang–Mills theory in a particular kind of light–cone co–ordinates. We also describe how using conformal invariance the problem can be mapped from Minkowski space to its conformal completion. Then we derive the Poisson algebra of the Wilson loops. We note that in four–dimensional Yang-Mills theory the algebra can be simplified. Then we discuss the Mandelstam identities satisfied by the gauge invariant variables. We believe that the Poisson algebras we find are of independent interest (for example as a starting point for closed string field theory); therefore we give a direct proof of the Jacobi identity of the algebra without using its representation in terms of gauge fields. We show that the Mandelstam identities describe surfaces in the dual of the Lie algebra that are invariant under the action of the algebra. Many of the calculations and technical details are in the appendices.

2. Yang-Mills theory in the light-cone coordinates and the symplectic form

In this section we will give a formulation of Yang-Mills theory using light cone coordinates [16]. The advantage of this formalism is that the Yang-Mills action is first order in its "time" derivatives and thus the Yang-Mills potential becomes a self-conjugate variable in the Hamiltonian formalism. This makes it possible to describe the canonical structure entirely in terms of the gauge invariant loop variables constructed out of the Yang–Mills potential.

We will first state the conventions that will be used in d space-time dimensions.We define the light-cone variables as follows;

$$u = t - r \qquad r, \theta^1, \theta^2, \ldots, \theta^{d-2}. \tag{1}$$

where t and r are the time and radial coordinates in Minkowski space and θ's are the corresponding angular variables in d dimensions. If one uses these coordinates, the metric

can be expressed as,

$$ds^2 = du(du + 2dr) - r^2((d\theta^1)^2 + \sin^2\theta^1(d\theta^2)^2 + \ldots + \sin^2\theta^1 \sin^2\theta^2 \ldots \sin^2\theta^{d-3}(d\theta^{d-2})^2). \tag{2}$$

In this paper $d = 4$ will be of special interest and we will state the metric in more conventional coordinates;

$$ds^2 = du(du + 2dr) - r^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2). \tag{3}$$

It is useful to find some shorthand symbols for the angular scaling factors in the metric and we define accordingly $\Phi_1, \Phi_2 \ldots \Phi_{d-2}$ as,

$$\Phi_1 = 1, \quad \Phi_2 = \sin\theta^1, \quad \ldots \Phi_{d-2} = \sin\theta^1 \sin\theta^2 ... \sin\theta^{d-3}. \tag{4}$$

Also, $\sqrt{-g} = r^{d-2}\Phi$, where $\Phi = \sin^{d-3}\theta^1 \sin^{d-4}\theta^2 \ldots \sin\theta^{d-3}$. Yang-Mills theory is defined through the vector potential A_μ, which is a Lie algebra valued vector. The Yang-Mills action is given by,

$$S = -\frac{1}{4}\int \sqrt{-g}\mathrm{Tr}F_{\mu\nu}F^{\mu\nu}dudrd\Omega. \tag{5}$$

where $d\Omega = d\theta^1 \ldots d\theta^{d-2}$ and $F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu + [A_\mu, A_\nu]$. A_μ can be written as $A^a_\mu T_a$ where T_a are the generators of the Lie algebra $\underline{G}$. We will usually take the structure group G to be $U(N)$, although the case of $SU(N)$ will be occassionally discussed.

With our choice of variables, $\frac{\partial}{\partial u}$ is in fact a time like vector and $\frac{\partial}{\partial r}$ is null. We will regard u as the evolution variable so that the initial data is given on the light-cone $u =$ constant. It will be convenient to choose the gauge $A_r = 0$. As a result,

$$F^{ur} = F_{ru}, \quad F^{ri} = \frac{1}{r^2}\Phi_i^{-2}(F_{ri} - F_{ui}), \quad F^{ui} = -\frac{1}{r^2}\Phi_i^{-2}F_{ri}, \quad F^{ij} = \frac{1}{r^4}\Phi_i^{-2}\Phi_j^{-2}F_{ij}.$$

Also,

$$F_{ui} = \partial_u A_i - \nabla_i A_u, \quad F_{ri} = \partial_r A_i, \quad F_{ur} = -\partial_r A_u, \quad F_{ij} = \partial_i A_j - \nabla_j A_i. \tag{6}$$

where we defined the covariant derivative as $\nabla_i = \partial_i + [A_i,\ ]$.

$$S = -\frac{1}{4\alpha^2}\int \Phi r^{d-2}\{-2\mathrm{Tr}(\partial_r A_u)^2 - 4r^{-2}\Phi_i^{-2}\mathrm{Tr}(\partial_u A_i \partial_r A_i) + 4r^{-2}\Phi_i^{-2}\mathrm{Tr}(\partial_r A_i \nabla_i A_u) + 2r^{-2}\Phi_i^{-2}\mathrm{Tr}(\partial_r A_i \partial_r A_i) + r^{-4}\Phi_i^{-2}\Phi_j^{-2}\mathrm{Tr}F_{ij}F_{ij}\}dudrd\Omega.$$

where we assumed summation over repeated indices.

Since A_u does not have a "time" derivative (i.e., derivative with respect to the evolution variable u) in the action we may eliminate it by using its equation of motion and get a reduced action:

$$\Phi\partial_r(r^{d-2}\partial_r A_u) - r^{d-4}\nabla_i(\Phi_i^{-2}\partial_r A_i) = 0. \tag{7}$$

Using the integral operator ∂_r^{-1} we get,

$$A_u = \Phi^{-1}\partial_r^{-1}\frac{1}{r^{d-2}}\partial_r^{-1}(r^{d-4}\nabla_i(\Phi_i^{-2}\partial_r A_i)). \tag{8}$$

This equation is enough to eliminate A_u and obtain the reduced action as,

$$S = \frac{-1}{4\alpha^2}\int \{-2r^{2-d}\Phi^{-1}\mathrm{Tr}(\partial_r^{-1}r^{d-4}\nabla_i(\Phi_i^{-2}\partial_r A_i))^2 - 4r^{d-4}\Phi\Phi_i^{-2}\mathrm{Tr}\partial_u A_i \partial_r A_i + 4r^{d-4}\Phi\Phi_i^{-2}\mathrm{Tr}(\nabla_i\Phi^{-1}\partial_r^{-1}r^{2-d}\partial_r^{-1}r^{d-4}\nabla_j(\Phi_j^{-2}\partial_r A_j))(\partial_r A_i) + 2r^{d-4}\Phi\Phi_i^{-2}\mathrm{Tr}\partial_r A_i\partial_r A_i + r^{d-6}\Phi\Phi_i^{-2}\Phi_j^{-2}\mathrm{Tr}F_{ij}F_{ij}\}dudrd\Omega.$$

This action is already first order in its evolution variable. Therefore A_i on the initial surface $u =$ constant, are co–ordinates on the phase space of the theory. We can read off the Poisson brackets of these variables from the above action. The anti–symmetric part of the operator $\Phi\Phi_i^{-2}r^{d-4}\partial_r$ (putting $\alpha = 1$ for simplicity) can be interpreted to be the the symplectic form. The Poisson brackets are given by its inverse. Let us define the Green's function $f(r,r') =< r|2(r^{d-4}\partial_r + \partial_r r^{d-4})^{-1}|r' >$ and impose the antisymmetry condition, $f(r,r') = -f(r',r)$. We can solve its defining differential equation to get,

$$f(r,r') = \frac{1}{2}(rr')^{2-d/2}\mathrm{sign}(r-r'). \tag{9}$$

Here we define sign function to be,

$$\text{sign}(r-r') = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } r > r' \\ 0, & \text{if } r = r' \\ -1, & \text{if } r < r'. \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

Now we can write down the Poisson brackets of the variables A_i:

$$\{A_i^a(\theta^k, r, u), A_j^b(\theta'^k, r', u')\} = \delta^{ab}\delta_{ij}\delta^{d-2}(\theta^k - \theta'^k)\Phi^{-1}\Phi_i^2 f(r, r'). \tag{11}$$

It is most natural to choose the initial value surface $u =$ constant to be the light-cone in the infinite past, since, all the dynamical degrees of freedom are radiative. This will also enable us to express the canonical structure above more elegantly in terms of gauge invariant variables. However, in the co–ordinate system we have been using, this will be a singular limit. One solution is to make a conformal mapping of the metric tensor so that the light–cone in the infinite past is brought to a finite 'distance'. For $d = 4$, classical Yang–Mills theory is conformally invariant, so that we can use this conformal mapping quite naturally. We will see several other simplifications in the four dimensional case. It is gratifying that these simplifications occur in the physically interesting case.

3. Yang–Mills Theory on the Conformal Completion of the Minkowski Space

Let us recall briefly the conformal completion of Minkowski space. The idea is to bring the points at infinity to a finite distance by using a conformally equivalent metric:

$$g_{\mu\nu} \mapsto \hat{g}_{\mu\nu} = \Omega^2 g_{\mu\nu}. \tag{12}$$

Moreover new co–ordinates are found, which remain finite at these 'points at infinity'. We will refer to [19] for the details. If we denote the Minkowski space by $\mathcal{M}$ then it is possible to adjoin to $\mathcal{M}$ a certain boundary surface, called $\mathcal{I}$, in such a way that $\hat{g}_{\mu\nu}$ extends smoothly to this boundary. This new space is denoted by $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$ and we have $\mathcal{I} = \partial\bar{\mathcal{M}}$

and $\mathcal{M} = \text{int}\bar{\mathcal{M}}$. We define

$$u = t - r \quad \text{and} \quad v = t + r. \tag{13}$$

We further introduce R and T as

$$R = \tan^{-1} v - \tan^{-1} u \quad T = \tan^{-1} u + \tan^{-1} v. \tag{14}$$

and define $U = T - R$. Then we can express the new metric in terms of U and R and the angular coordinates;

$$d\hat{s}^2 = dU(dU + 2dR) - \sin^2 R((d\theta^1)^2 + \sin^2 \theta^1 (d\theta^2)^2). \tag{15}$$

This is conformally equivalent to the old metric with conformal factor

$$\Omega = 2(1 + u^2)^{-1/2}(1 + v^2)^{-1/2}. \tag{16}$$

This space $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$ is usually represented by two cones attached at their openings, and the resulting spherical intersection is identified to one point, called i^0. This point represents the spatial infinity [Refer to figure-1]. The conic boundaries are denoted by $\mathcal{I}^-$ and $\mathcal{I}^+$ respectively.

If we define $V = T + R$, the region $-\pi < U < \pi$ and $-\pi < V < \pi$ corresponds to $\mathcal{M}$. By extending their domains smoothly $U = -\pi$ corresponds to $\mathcal{I}^-$ and $V = \pi$ to $\mathcal{I}^+$. We also have past timelike infinity i^- given by $U = V = -\pi$ and future timelike infinity i^+ given by $U = V = \pi$. The spatial infinity i^0 corresponds to just one point $U = -V = -\pi$. Physically $\mathcal{I}^-$ denotes the future light cone of past timelike infinity and $\mathcal{I}^+$ denotes the past light cone of future timelike infinity. (In the references they are called past null cone and future null cone respectively, and this is in agreement with with our terminology if we take i^0 to be the reference point).

It is possible also to identify all three points i^-, i^+ and i^0 to one point yielding a compact space–time, with topology $S^3 \times S^1$. The (trace of) parallel transport operators around around the homotopically non–trivial curves on this space will provide gauge invariant obeservables for Yang–Mills theory. These are in fact the variables we will use. We find it more convenient to not perform this identification, so that the observables we consider will be the (trace of) parallel transport operators along open curves from i^- to i^0.

In 4 dimensions Yang-Mills field equations are conformally invariant. So the phase space of Yang-Mills theory in Minkowski background can be mapped to the space of solutions on an open domain of $S^3 \times R$ with appropriate initial data. We will write the action in 4 dimensions using this conformal mapping and give initial conditions on the future light cone of past timelike infinity $\mathcal{I}^-$. In other dimensions one can still specify initial data on the same surface and write down the Yang-Mills theory on an analogous space, but there is no direct correspondence between this theory and the Yang-Mills with Minkowski background. Therefore such a conformal map is most useful in 4 dimensions.

Since the only difference in the metric is the introduction of $\sin R$ instead of r, we can read of the results immediately for the action by replacing r with $\sin R$. We are interested in the symplectic form, so we will state the result directly;

$$\begin{aligned} S = -\frac{1}{4}\int \{ & -2\sin^2 R\Phi^{-1}\mathrm{Tr}(\partial_R^{-1}\nabla_i(\Phi_i^{-2}\partial_R A_i))^2 + 4\Phi\Phi_i^{-2}\mathrm{Tr}\partial_U A_i \partial_R A_i \\ & + 4\Phi\Phi_i^{-2}\mathrm{Tr}\nabla_i\Phi^{-1}\partial_R^{-1}\sin^{-2} R\partial_R^{-1}\nabla_j(\Phi_j^{-2}\partial_R A_j)(\partial_R A_i) \\ & + 2\Phi\Phi_i^{-2}\mathrm{Tr}\partial_R A_i\partial_R A_i + \sin^{-2} R\Phi\Phi_i^{-2}\Phi_j^{-2}\mathrm{Tr}F_{ij}F_{ij}\} dR dU d\theta^1 d\theta^2. \end{aligned}$$

and this gives,

$$\{A_i^a(R,\theta^k,U), A_j^b(R',\theta'^k,U)\} = \delta_{ij}\delta^{ab}\delta^2(\theta^k-\theta'^k)\Phi^{-1}\Phi_i^2 h(R,R'). \tag{17}$$

where $h(R,R') = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{sign}(R-R')$.

From now on for 4 dimensional Yang-Mills theory we will use this Poisson bracket and the conformal completion of the Minkowski space. For other dimensions we will continue to use the Minkowski background.

4. Wilson "Loops" and the Poisson Algebra

We will start from the four dimensional case and give the corresponding formulae in other dimensions. Once we impose the gauge condition $A_R = 0$ the residual gauge transformations have to be independent of R. Thus a parallel transport around a curve on a U = constant surface will be gauge–invariant as long as it is closed in the angular directions: it does not need to be closed in the radial direction. We will still call them "loops", as we cannot think of a better name. A complete set of obserbles is provided by "loops" that lie entirely on a U = constant surface. This is because the A_U component carries no new information: it can be eliminated in terms of A_i.

As a result we define a "loop" to be piecewise differentiable maps $\xi : [0, L] \to \bar{\mathcal{M}}$ such that ξ^U remains constant, $\xi^i = \theta^i$ for $i = 1, 2$ and $\xi^i(0) = \xi^i(L)$.

Define also the Wilson "loop" variable ,

$$W(A, \xi) \equiv \mathrm{Tr}\hat{e}^{\int_\xi A_\alpha d\xi^\alpha}. \tag{18}$$

We are considering A_μ as matrices in the fundamental representation of $U(N)$. Also, $\hat{e}$ denotes the path ordered exponential. From our earlier comments it is clear that $W(\xi)$ form a complete set of gauge invariant observables.

We now wish to express the symplectic structure of the Yang–Mills theory in terms of these gauge invariant observables. The computation is in principle straightforward. It turns out to be convenient to replace the curve ξ by a piece-wise linear approximation to it. The details are given in Appendix-1. We get the following Lie algebra, first obtained

in Ref. [5]:

$$\{W(\xi_1), W(\xi_2)\} =$$
$$\int d\theta^1 d\theta^2 ds_1 ds_2 \delta^2(\xi_1^k(s_1) - \theta^k)\delta^2(\xi_2^k(s_2) - \theta^k)h(R(s_1), R(s_2))\xi_1'.\xi_2' W(\xi_1 \circ_\theta \xi_2).$$

where we defined $\xi_1'.\xi_2'$ to be $\sum_k \frac{d\xi_1^k}{ds_1}\frac{d\xi_2^k}{ds_2}\Phi_k^2\Phi^{-1}$ and also $W(\xi_1 \circ_\theta \xi_2)$ denotes a "loop" product we will explain below.

These Poisson brackets of the Wilson 'loops' form a Lie algebra only for a specific normalization of the $U(1)$ charge: when it has the same length as the $SU(N)$ generators under the Killing form. This is the value of the $U(1)$ coupling constant for which the large N limit is well–defined [20].For the $SU(N)$ gauge theory instead we would obtain the following result,

$$\{W(\xi_1), W(\xi_2)\} = \int d\theta^1 d\theta^2 ds_1 ds_2 \delta^2(\xi_1^k - \theta^k)\delta^2(\xi_2^k - \theta^k)h(R_1, R_2)\xi_1'.\xi_2' W(\xi_1 \circ_\theta \xi_2)$$
$$- \frac{1}{N}\int d\theta^1 d\theta^2 ds_1 ds_2 \delta^2(\xi_1^k - \theta^k)\delta^2(\xi_2^k - \theta^k)h(R_1, R_2)\xi_1'.\xi_2' W(\xi_1)W(\xi_2).$$

which is a quadratic Poisson algebra and not a Lie Algebra(we suppressed the explicit s dependence). Thus from this point of view the $U(N)$ gauge theory with $U(1)$ charge chosen as above is simpler than an $SU(N)$ gauge theory.

This algebra is invariant under reparametrization of the curves, $s \to \hat{s} = \phi(s)$, ϕ being monotonic. If the curve future pointing everywhere, $R(s)$ is a monotonic function, and we can use R itself as a parameter. That would reduce the above expression to

$$\{W(\xi_1), W(\xi_2)\} = \int d\theta^1 d\theta^2 dR_1 dR_2 \delta^2(\xi_1^k - \theta^k)\delta^2(\xi_2^k - \theta^k)h(R_1, R_2)\xi_1'.\xi_2' W(\xi_1 \circ_\theta \xi_2). \quad (19)$$

We will able to simplify these relations further.

Now we give the definition of the "loop" product. First we introduce a concept of intersection of "loops". Two "loops" are said to intersect if their θ^i coordinates coincide

at some point. To make this more precise, consider the given "loops" $\xi_1 : [0, L_1] \to \Sigma$ and $\xi_2 : [0, L_2] \to \Sigma$,where we define $U = cst$ surface to be Σ. They are said to intersect iff $\xi_1^k(l_1) = \xi_2^k(l_2)$ for some $l_1 \in [0, L_1]$ and $l_2 \in [0, L_2]$. One can look at it somewhat more geometrically and say that two "loops" intersect if their projections to a transverse surface coincide somewhere (figure-2). (This concept of intersection is the one implied by the delta functions in the Poisson brackets.) Next, we define a product of two intersecting "loops". Suppose that the point of intersection is Q_1 on ξ_1 and Q_2 on ξ_2. Denote their corresponding coordinates as (R_1, θ^i) and (R_2, θ^i) respectively. Define $\xi_1 \circ_\theta \xi_2$ as the product with respect to the pair $Q_1 Q_2$ as follows: We start from $\xi_1(0)$ move along ξ_1 till we reach the intersection point Q_1. At that point jump to the "loop" ξ_2 and start from the intersection point Q_2, move along ξ_2 till $\xi_2(L_2)$. We jump down to $\xi_2(0)$ and move along ξ_2 till we reach Q_2. We move back to ξ_1 where we left at Q_1 and continue along ξ_1 till we reach $\xi_1(L_1)$. Figure-3 clarifies this product rule. Analytically we can express this in the following formula;

$$\xi_1 : [0, L_1] \to \Sigma \quad \xi_2 : [0, L_2] \to \Sigma. \tag{20}$$

When they intersect, $\xi_1^i(l_1) = \xi_2^i(l_2) = \theta^i$,

$$(\xi_1 \circ_\theta \xi_2)(k) = \begin{cases} \xi_1(k) & \text{for } k \in [0, l_1] \\ \xi_2(k + (l_2 - l_1)) & \text{for } k \in [l_1, l_1 + L_2 - l_2] \\ \xi_2(k - l_1 - L_2 + l_2) & \text{for } k \in [l_1 + L_2 - l_2, l_1 + L_2] \\ \xi_1(k - L_2) & \text{for } k \in [l_1 + L_2, L_1 + L_2] \end{cases}. \tag{21}$$

This product is associative, i.e. it does not matter which way we group the terms, if we keep the intersection pairs the same. This will be usefull later on.

We will give the corresponding formulae in other dimensions with a Minkowski background; they are obtained exactly the same way, and the definition of the "loops" are also the same except this time the angular variables are from $i = 1$ to $d-2$ where d =dimension of the space-time. The intersection and the product of Wilson "loops" is also defined analogously. In the $U(N)$ case we get,

$$\{W(\xi_1), W(\xi_2)\} = \int d\theta^1 d\theta^2 .. d\theta^{d-2} ds_1 ds_2 \delta^{d-2}(\xi_1^k(s_1) - \theta^k) \delta^{d-2}(\xi_2^k(s_2) - \theta^k)$$
$$f(r_1(s_1), r_2'(s_2)) \xi_1' . \xi_2' W(\xi_1 \circ_\theta \xi_2).$$

where $f(r, r')$ was defined before as an antisymmetric function. One can also give the formula in the case where we use r as a parameter. In other gauge theories there will be corresponding quadratic factors. This means that those algebras are not of Lie type.

A special property of four dimensional space–time is the two piece–wise differentiable curves on a light–cone intersect generaically at a finite number isolated points. In lower dimensions, the intersection will be along a continuum, while in higher dimensions, generically there is no intersection at all. For generic curves, the integrals in the Poisson algebra can be evaluated to give a sum,

$$\{W(\xi_1), W(\xi_2)\} = \sum\nolimits_P h(R_1^P, R_2^P) \frac{\xi_1'.\xi_2'}{|\xi_1' \times \xi_2'|}\Big|_P W(\xi_1 \circ_P \xi_2). \tag{22}$$

The cross product is the usual antisymmetric product of two vectors ξ_1' and ξ_2' without any angular factors. The dot product is as defined before, and P refers to an intersection pair that we may also write as $P\bar{P}$. The quantity $\frac{\xi_1'.\xi_2'}{|\xi_1' \times \xi_2'|}\Big|_P$ is (upto a sign) the cotangent of the angle of intersection of the two curves on S^2 at P. Also, $h(R_1, R_2) = 1/2\text{sign}(R_1 - R_2)$.

The form of the algebra shows explicitly that the result is parameter independent and geometric in nature. In fact it is possible to motivate this based on its very geometric character; this will be the point of view we will pursue in the second part.

One should note the interesting situation that the $SU(N)$ case will lead to a quadratic algebra of a fairly simple type. It can also be motivated based on its purely geometric character. We state the result; it seems that this is the only realistic situation where one has a quadratic algebra.

$$\{W(\xi_1), W(\xi_2)\} = \sum\nolimits_P h(R_1^P, R_2^P) \frac{\xi_1'.\xi_2'}{|\xi_1' \times \xi_2'|}\Big|_P (W(\xi_1 \circ_P \xi_2) - \frac{1}{N} W(\xi_1) W(\xi_2)). \tag{23}$$

In this paper we will mainly concentrate on the $U(N)$ algebra and plan to return to

the quadratic case elsewhere.

In three dimensions, the theory is highly interacting, in the sense that the reduction to a finite sum is not possible. This is due to the fact that in three dimensions we need to use curves in two dimensions, and their intersection is given by their projection to some transverse surface, which is one dimensional in this case. But in one dimension any two "loops" intersect along a continuum. This renders the algebra to an integral over the intersecting regions. One can work out the algebra in the generic case. The situation in $d > 4$ is generically simpler. We see that the intersection can be understood by projecting to a space of dimension$\geq$ 3. So it is very unlikely for "loops" to intersect at all as the dimension grows. The Poisson algebra is generically trivial (abelian). When the two "loops" do intersect the resulting expression is highly singular due to the presence of the δ-functions. In this case the result is not well- defined. This suggests that the "right" dimension, so to speak, is four.

In four dimensions there are also nongeneric situation for which the algebra is not well-defined; such as two "loops" intersecting along a continuous portion, or their tangent vectors being paralel at the point of intersection. These we will exclude by their nongeneric nature. To be more precise, we will restrict ourselves to the class of "loops" for which any pair of them intersects at a finite number of points. This subset of "loops" as we will describe in the second part , is going to be an open dense subset of the space of "loops". Our algebra is defined on this subset of loops. This is not such an unfamiliar situation. In quantum mechanics for example most of the time we define operators on an open dense subset, and try to find self-adjoint extensions to a larger domain(if possible). We would like to have a similar philosophy in this case. The details of these arguments are going to be given in the second part, to avoid the repetition we will be somewhat heuristic in this part.

It is clear that the Wilson " loop" variables form an overcomplete set of observables. Among all functions of ξ, those that represent parallel transport with respect to a connection A must satisfy some constraints. Mandelstam obtained these constraints in the case of based loops. To obtain similar identities in our case, it will be convenient to extend our "loops" so that all of them pass through the points i^- and i^0 (see figure-4). They will then be based loops on compactified Minkowsky space. In fact we can attach a straight–line in the R direction to the end–point of any "loop" without changing the value of $W(A,\xi)$, since $A_R = 0$. Such an extended "loop" that goes from past infinity to spatial infinity will be denoted typically by $\hat{\xi}$.

Now, we can state the Mandelstam identities that the Wilson "loop" variables must satisfy [1], [12]. They simply capture the fact that W is the trace of an $N \times N$ matrix. For clarity we first state the $U(1)$ and $U(2)$ gauge theories explicitly; for $U(1)$,

$$W(\hat{\xi}_1 \circ_P \hat{\xi}_2) = W(\hat{\xi}_1)W(\hat{\xi}_2). \tag{24}$$

where P is any point of intersection of a pair of "loops".

For $U(2)$, the identity involves the simultaneous intersection of three curves. Generically this will only happen at i^- or i^0. At these points,

$$W(\hat{\xi}_1 \circ_P \hat{\xi}_2 \circ_P \hat{\xi}_3) + W(\hat{\xi}_1 \circ_P \hat{\xi}_3 \circ_P \hat{\xi}_2) - W(\hat{\xi}_1 \circ_P \hat{\xi}_2)W(\hat{\xi}_3) - W(\hat{\xi}_1 \circ_P \hat{\xi}_3)W(\hat{\xi}_2) -$$

$$W(\hat{\xi}_3 \circ_P \hat{\xi}_2)W(\hat{\xi}_1) + W(\hat{\xi}_1)W(\hat{\xi}_2)W(\hat{\xi}_3) = 0.$$

We used the associativity of the product and remove the paranthesis.

Now, we can state the $U(N)$ case,

$$\sum_{\text{cycle decom. of } S_{N+1}} (-1)^\pi W(\hat{\xi}_{i_1} \circ_P \hat{\xi}_{i_2} \circ_P ... \circ_P \hat{\xi}_{i_{k_1}})W(\hat{\xi}_{i_{k_1+1}} \circ_P \hat{\xi}_{i_{k_1+2}} \circ_P ... \circ_P \hat{\xi}_{i_{k_1+k_2}})...$$

$$W(\hat{\xi}_{i_{k_1+k_2+...k_r+1}} \circ_P \hat{\xi}_{i_{k_1+k_2+...k_r+2}} \circ_P ... \circ_P \hat{\xi}_{i_{k_1+k_2+...k_{r+1}}}) = 0.$$

where $k_1, k_2, ...k_{r+1}$ denotes an arbitrary cycle. It satisfies $k_1 + k_2 + ... + k_{r+1} = N+1$ and the set $i_{k_1+...+k_s}, ..., i_{k_1+...+k_{s+1}}$ denotes a set of k_{s+1} distinct numbers out of $1, 2, ...N+1$.

A permutation is determined through its cycle decomposition, and the above set of numbers specifies such a cycle. Here π is used to denote the sign of the permutation. S_{N+1} denotes the permutation group of $N+1$ numbers. P is also taken to be a common intersection point of $N=1$ "loops"; and generically P can be only i^0 or i^-. A small deformation of one of the curves will remove any other simultaneous intersection. These are simplification of four dimensional Yang–Mills theory.

Dimension three is exceptional, in the sense that there are an infinite number of common intersection points for an arbitrary set of "loops". We can say that there are an infinite number of Mandelstam identities in the case of three dimensions. This means that there are an infinite number of constraints. Therefore the theory could be highly interacting and complicated.

In the next section we will try to reverse the earlier point of view. We will postulate a Lie bracket relation on the space of functions on loops. It will be necessary to verify directly that these satisfy the Jacobi identity. Now it is possible to define a dynamical system whose phase space is a co–adjoint orbit of this Lie algebra. We will show that the Mandelstam identities define surfaces in the co–adjoint orbits which are invariant under the action of the Lie algebra. Thus we suggest that the Phase spaces of $U(N)$ Yang–Mills theories are the co–adjoint orbits of our Lie algebra. (We are not able to show this except for $U(1)$, since it is not clear if there are constraints in addition to the Mandelstam constriants.) Eventually it might be possible to derive Yang-Mills theory from a theory of loop variables, but we do not attempt to do that here.

5. The algebra of "loops" in $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$

In this section we will study the "loop" algebra *ab initio*: not as derived from Yang-Mills theory. Let us consider $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$ (it is described in section-3) and let Σ be the $U=$ constant

surface.

Define "loops" on $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$ as follows. $\xi : [0, L] \to \Sigma$. In particular we choose Σ to be $\mathcal{I}^-$ (since this the surface where we give the initial data). We assume that $\xi^i(0) = \xi^i(L)$ where $i = 1, 2$ denotes the angular coordinates. We do not require $\xi^R(0)$ to be equal to $\xi^R(L)$, hence the term "loop". These functions are assumed to be piecewise differentiable and continuous only in the θ^k variables.

Next we introduce a concept of intersection for two "loops" given by the functions $\xi_1 : [0, L_1] \to \Sigma$ and $\xi_2 : [0, L_2] \to \Sigma$. Two "loops" are said to intersect if their angular coordinates coincide at some pair of points. More precisely, if $\xi_1^i(l_1) = \xi_2^i(l_2)$ for some $l_1 \in [0, L_1]$ and $l_2 \in [0, L_2]$ and for $i = 1, 2$, then they intersect at the corresponding points $Q_1(R_1, \theta^i)$ and $Q_2(R_2, \theta^i)$ respectively. So an intersection is specified by a pair of points (see figure-5). We also define a product of two intersecting "loops". The most natural one which will mix the geometry of two "loops" is given by the following rule; suppose that two "loops" intersect at the pair Q_1Q_2. Define $\xi_1 \circ_{Q_1Q_2} \xi_2$ as the product with respect to the above pair. Start from $\xi_1(0)$ move along it till we reach Q_1. At this point jump to the second "loop" and start from Q_2, move on ξ_2 till we reach $\xi_2(L_2)$. Then jump to $\xi_2(0)$ and move along ξ_2 till we come to the intersection Q_2. Now the motion along the second "loop" is comlete, we jump back to the first "loop" where we left it, namely the point Q_1. Continue to move on ξ_1 till we reach $\xi_1(L_1)$. This gives the product loop. Since the operation is piecewise differentiable the resulting object belongs to the class of "loops" that we specified. So algebraically the operation is closed. The product can be given by the analytic expression;

$$\xi_1 : [0, L_1] \to \Sigma \quad \xi_2 : [0, L_2] \to \Sigma. \tag{25}$$

Assume that $\xi_1^i(l_1) = \xi_2^i(l_2) = \theta^i$,

$$(\xi_1 \circ_\theta \xi_2)(k) = \begin{cases} \xi_1(k) & \text{for } k \in [0, l_1] \\ \xi_2(k + (l_2 - l_1)) & \text{for } k \in [l_1, l_1 + L_2 - l_2] \\ \xi_2(k - l_1 - L_2 + l_2) & \text{for } k \in [l_1 + L_2 - l_2, l_1 + L_2] \\ \xi_1(k - L_2) & \text{for } k \in [l_1 + L_2, L_1 + L_2] \end{cases}. \tag{26}$$

Now, we introduce the radial extension of a "loop". $\bar{\xi}$ is called an extension of ξ if $\bar{\xi} : [0, \bar{L}] \to \Sigma$ and $\xi : [0, L] \to \Sigma$ such that $[0, L] \mapsto [0, \bar{L}]$ by translation i.e. $x \in [0, L] \mapsto x+a \in [0, \bar{L}]$ thus $[a, L+a] \subset [0, \bar{L}]$. Furthermore, $\bar{\xi}|_{[a,L+a]} = \xi$. This is the natural concept of extension. For our purposes, the extensions along the radial direction are important. So, $\bar{\xi}$ is a radial extension if $\bar{\xi}|_{[0,\bar{L}]\setminus[a,L+a]}$ remains a constant in θ^i directions(see figure-6). One should notice that our product rule can be used to define the extension.

We denote the space of "loops" considered as directed geometric objects by the set $\mathcal{L}$ and define a function W from this to complex numbers, C. By that, we mean that the parametrization is essentially immaterial; so in fact we consider two "loops" to be equivalent if they can be related by a reparametrization of positive Jacobian. The direction is related to the direction of time, since $\frac{\partial}{\partial R}$ is a null vector, the change of direction corresponds to the time reversal. Thus, we require that W does not depend which particular representation has been chosen; it depends purely on the intrinsic geometry and the direction.

Moreover, we postulate that $W(\xi) = W(\bar{\xi})$ for any radial extension $\bar{\xi}$. If we are looking at purely radial "loops" we may introduce an arbitrary normalization condition. This however is going to be fixed by the constraints that we will introduce later on. This will imply that the radial extension can be assumed to be completed for any "loop" as far as W is concerned. This leads us to define the maximal radial extension for a given "loop". If we think of ξ being radially extended till the ends reach i^0 and i^- respectively, the resulting "loop" is called the maximal radial extension of ξ. As we defined before there will be a representation of this in the equivalence class of directed "loops" $\mathcal{L}$. We denote

one such representative as $\hat{\xi}$ and it satisfies $\hat{\xi}(0) = i^-$ and $\hat{\xi}(\hat{L}) = i^0$ or vice versa if $[0, \hat{L}]$ is the interval of parametrization. It is enough to consider the maximally radially extended set of "loops" , therefore we denote this as $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$ and assume that W is a continuous function from $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$ to C. On the cartesian product we introduce an algebra satisfied by W's. It is postulated as follows;

$$\{W(\hat{\xi}_1), W(\hat{\xi}_2)\} = \sum\nolimits_P h(R_1^P, R_2^{\bar{P}}) \frac{\hat{\xi}_1'.\hat{\xi}_2'}{|\hat{\xi}_1' \times \hat{\xi}_2'|}\Big|_P W(\hat{\xi}_1 \circ_P \hat{\xi}_2). \tag{27}$$

Here $h(R, R') = 1/2\text{sign}(R - R')$ and $\hat{\xi}_1'.\hat{\xi}_2' = \sum_k \frac{d\hat{\xi}_1^k}{ds_1}\frac{d\hat{\xi}_2^k}{ds_2}\Phi^{-1}\Phi_k^2$,$\hat{\xi}_1' \times \hat{\xi}_2' = \frac{d\hat{\xi}_1^1}{ds_1}\frac{d\hat{\xi}_2^2}{ds_2} - \frac{d\hat{\xi}_1^2}{ds_1}\frac{d\hat{\xi}_2^1}{ds_2}$. This has some geometrical meaning. If we consider the tangent vectors their dot product gives the cosine of the angle, and the denumerator is the absolute value of the sine. There are some interesting points about the conformal invariance of the algebra.[we need to expand this argument]. The notation $P, \bar{P}$ denotes the intersection pair; they have the same angular coordinates but different R values. This is the reason for using P for the angular part and distinguish the radial part. For this algebra to make sense though we need to restrict ourselves to a subset of $\hat{\mathcal{L}} \times \hat{\mathcal{L}}$. This is denoted by $\widehat{\mathcal{FL}}$ and defined to be the subset for which any pair of "loops" have a finite number of intersections. This is in fact the generic situation and the above subset is an open dense subset in an appropriate topology. The extension of the algebra to the whole set can be defined by some extension process.

From now on, we consider "loops" belonging to $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$ and the above algebra postulated over the subset $\widehat{\mathcal{FL}}$. We can state that the form of $h(R_1, R_2)$ guarantees the antisymmetry of the algebra. Furthermore, by considering a generic situation it is possible to prove the Jacobi identity on this subset(appendix-2). Namely,

$$\{W(\hat{\xi}_1), \{W(\hat{\xi}_2), W(\hat{\xi}_3)\}\} + \text{cyclic perm. of } (1, 2, 3) = 0 \tag{28}$$

The result is that the above algebra is a Poisson Algebra and it is of the Lie type.

We want to introduce the Yang-Mills theory as a natural theory with the phase space as the set of maximally radially extended curves. The conjecture here is that it should be possible to think of this as some sort of an orbit structure. It is very similar to the coadjoint orbits in Lie Groups. For symplectic action of a Lie group, we may ask what are the natural symplectic manifolds which admit this group as a symmetry group. The answer is given by Krillov. The results are the coadjoint orbits of the group with a natural symplectic form on them. We do not have a group structure for the "loops", but we have an algebraic operation on them. On top of it we have a Poisson algebra of the Lie type. We intrepret the action to be also generated by the Poisson algebra and think of the resulting element as an element of the orbit. If we can give a characterization of this orbit structure in another way this will be the natural way to define a Gauge theory. We can indeed show that there are some identities satisfied by W's which are invariant under the Poisson action. These will be some constraint surfaces.

We introduce the constraint surfaces in the space of W's. The most natural set of constraints that we may introduce involves two "loops" and a simple quadratic relation. The next step would involve three "loops" and the most symmetric combination. We can go on like this and introduce $N+1$ "loops", which satisfy a constraint of order $N+1$ and involves the most symmetric combination. These will be the Mandelstam identities. For them to make sense, i.e. for "loops" to be intermingle we expect them to intersect. There are two such generic points, i^- and i^0. Other then that there will be some isolated set of configurations in the $N+1$ fold product of $\hat{\mathcal{L}}$. This will lead some reduction in the degrees of freedom of the theory.

Let us state the Mandelstam identities; the simplest one will be,

$$W(\hat{\xi}_1 \circ_P \hat{\xi}_2) = W(\hat{\xi}_1)W(\hat{\xi}_2). \tag{29}$$

where P is any point of intersection. Every pair of "loops" intersect at i^- and i^0.

$$W(\hat{\xi}_1 \circ_P \hat{\xi}_2 \circ_P \hat{\xi}_3) + W(\hat{\xi}_1 \circ_P \hat{\xi}_3 \circ_P \hat{\xi}_2) - W(\hat{\xi}_1 \circ_P \hat{\xi}_2)W(\hat{\xi}_3) - W(\hat{\xi}_1 \circ_P \hat{\xi}_3)W(\hat{\xi}_2) -$$

$$W(\hat{\xi}_3 \circ_P \hat{\xi}_2)W(\hat{\xi}_1) + W(\hat{\xi}_1)W(\hat{\xi}_2)W(\hat{\xi}_3) = 0.$$

where we take P to be generically i^0 or i^-.

Therefore, the general such identity we can propose is given by,

$$\sum_{\text{cycle decom. of } S_{N+1}} (-1)^\pi W(\hat{\xi}_{i_1} \circ_P \hat{\xi}_{i_2} \circ_P ... \circ_P \hat{\xi}_{i_{k_1}})W(\hat{\xi}_{i_{k_1+1}} \circ_P \hat{\xi}_{i_{k_1+2}} \circ_P ... \circ_P \hat{\xi}_{i_{k_1+k_2}})...$$

$$W(\hat{\xi}_{i_{k_1+k_2+...k_r+1}} \circ_P \hat{\xi}_{i_{k_1+k_2+...k_r+2}} \circ_P ... \circ_P \hat{\xi}_{i_{k_1+k_2+...k_{r+1}}}) = 0.$$

where $k_1, k_2, ...k_{r+1}$ denotes an arbitrary cycle. It satisfies $k_1 + k_2 + ... + k_{r+1} = N+1$ and the set $i_{k_1+...+k_s}, ..., i_{k_1+...+k_{s+1}}$ denotes a set of k_{s+1} distinct numbers out of $1, 2, ...N+1$. A permutation is determined through its cycle decomposition, and the above set of numbers specifies such a cycle. Here π is used to denote the sign of the permutation. S_{N+1} denotes the permutation group of $N+1$ numbers. P is also taken to be a common intersection point, and generically P is i^0 or i^-. There may be some other intersection points for a set of $N+1$ "loops", but obviously it is very unlikely even for three of them to have such a common point.

We refer to the appendix-3 for the proof that these identities are preserved under the Poisson action in a generic case Since the identities are preserved, it implies that the Poisson action creates an orbit and each orbit is contained in one of these surfaces. But the converse is being true is the conjecture; that is, the identities (with possibly some restrictions, such as $|W| \leq 1$) are in fact enough to characterize the orbits. This way we postulate that the above set of W's on the space $\widehat{\mathcal{FL}}$ with the above Poisson algebra when restricted to a constraint surface of degree $N+1$ defines a $U(N)$ gauge theory. Each such surface is in fact an orbit of some action generated by the Poisson algebra itself(it is possible to give a more precise formulation). We know that one representation of this algebra is the four dimensional Yang-Mills theory in $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$ using the light-cone coordinates

with the gauge choice $A_R = 0$. The general representation theory of such an algebra is of great interest. Yet, we have no answer to such a question. The quantization of such a theory is accomplished by finding irreducible representations in an appropriate Hilbert space. This opens up a new set of questions that we would like to look at. We can formally demostrate that $U(1)$ gauge theory is determined by this set of identities if we also add the pure phase condition, $W(\hat{\xi})^* = W(\hat{\xi})^{-1}$. We can make the ansatz $W(\hat{\xi}) = e^{\phi(\hat{\xi})}$ and put into the Poisson algebra;

$$\{W(\hat{\xi}_1), W(\hat{\xi}_2)\} = e^{\phi(\hat{\xi}_1)}\{\phi(\hat{\xi}_1), \phi(\hat{\xi}_2)\}e^{\phi(\hat{\xi}_2)}. \tag{30}$$

But the other side is given by,

$$\{W(\hat{\xi}_1), W(\hat{\xi}_2)\} = \sum\nolimits_P h(R_1^P, R_2^P) \frac{\hat{\xi}_1'.\hat{\xi}_2'}{|\hat{\xi}_1' \times \hat{\xi}_2'|}\Big|_P W(\hat{\xi}_1 \circ_P \hat{\xi}_2). \tag{31}$$

Using the quadratic constraint this can further be simplified to

$$\{W(\hat{\xi}_1), W(\hat{\xi}_2)\} = F(\hat{\xi}_1, \hat{\xi}_2)e^{\phi(\hat{\xi}_1)}e^{\phi(\hat{\xi}_2)}. \tag{32}$$

where F denotes just a geometric factor which depends on the two "loops" and some intersection pairs. Cancelling out the common factors, we see that the result is,

$$\{\phi(\hat{\xi}_1), \phi(\hat{\xi}_2)\} = F(\hat{\xi}_1, \hat{\xi}_2). \tag{33}$$

We can always bring the above constant matrix formally to diagonal form, using an analogue of Darboux coordinates and in that the above function is expressed as

$$\phi(\hat{\xi}) = \int A_i d\hat{\xi}^i. \tag{34}$$

for some constant matrix (in the space of "loops" it will be a matrix; ordinarily a function in $\bar{\mathcal{M}}$ and it is a constant because it is not a functional of ξ) A_i and this is the desired representation.

6. *Appendix-1*

In this appendix we will give the derivation of the "loop" algebra assuming that the path ordered integral can be expressed via a piecewise linear "loop". In the limit as the distances between these and the original "loop" go to zero in an appropriate topology the result is going to be the integral.

Assume that η is such a generic piecewise linear loop. We denote the steps as Δs and assume that $d(\eta, \xi) \mapsto 0$.

$$W(\xi) = \lim_{\Delta\eta \mapsto 0} \mathrm{Tr} \prod (I + A_{i_k} \Delta\eta^{i_k}).$$

where $\Delta\eta$ refers to the supremum over the interval sizes. We can replace the intervals by the linear approximation and express this by the parameter s via $\Delta\eta = \eta' \Delta s$. When we are calculating the Poisson brackets, we will implicitly assume that the above limiting process is undertaken. For simplicity we keep the same letter for the "loop" integral. Using the definition we can calculate the Poisson brackets of the two "loops".

$$\begin{aligned} &\{W(\xi_1), W(\xi_2)\} \\ &= \lim_{\Delta s_1, \Delta s_2 \mapsto 0} \{\mathrm{Tr} \prod_k (I + A_{i_k} \xi_1'^{i_k} \Delta s_{1,k}), \mathrm{Tr} \prod_l (I + A_{j_l} \xi_2'^{j_l} \Delta s_{2,l})\}. \end{aligned}$$

We use the derivation property and express this as,

$$\begin{aligned} \{W(\xi_1), W(\xi_2)\} = \lim_{\Delta s_1, \Delta s_2 \mapsto 0} \sum_{m,n} \prod_{k<m} (I + A_{i_k} \xi_1'^{i_k} \Delta s_{1,k})^{\alpha_1}_{\alpha_2} \prod_{l<n} (I + A_{j_l} \xi_2'^{j_l} \Delta s_{2,l})^{\alpha_6}_{\alpha_5} \\ \{A^{\alpha_2}_{i_m,\alpha_3}, A^{\alpha_5}_{j_n,\alpha_4}\} \xi_1'^{i_m} \xi_2'^{j_n} \Delta s_{1,m} \Delta s_{2,n} \prod_{k>m} (I + A_{i_k} \xi_1' \Delta s_{1,k})^{\alpha_3}_{\alpha_1} \prod_{l>n} (I + A_{j_l} \xi_2' \Delta s_{2,l})^{\alpha_4}_{\alpha_6}. \end{aligned}$$

where α has been used to denote the Lie Algebra contractions. We need to employ the Poisson bracket of the A's and also use the completeness relation of the Lie Algebra generators. This depends on the way one will normalize the $U(1)$ generator and we give the result for $U(N)$ with the large-N convention and also $SU(N)$;

$$(T^a)^{\alpha_1}_{\beta_1}(T^a)^{\alpha_2}_{\beta_2} = \delta^{\alpha_1}_{\beta_2}\delta^{\alpha_2}_{\beta_1}$$
$$(T^a)^{\alpha_1}_{\beta_1}(T^a)^{\alpha_2}_{\beta_2} = \delta^{\alpha_1}_{\beta_2}\delta^{\alpha_2}_{\beta_1} - \frac{1}{N}\delta^{\alpha_1}_{\beta_1}\delta^{\alpha_2}_{\beta_2}.$$

We normalized the generators of $SU(N)$ to 1 and I to $1/\sqrt{N}$.

$$\{W(\xi_1), W(\xi_2)\} =$$
$$\lim_{\Delta s_1, \Delta s_2 \mapsto 0} \sum_{m,n} \prod_{k<m} (I + A_{i_k}\xi_1'^{i_k}\Delta s_{1,k})^{\alpha_1}_{\alpha_2} \prod_{l<n} (I + A_{j_l}\xi_2'^{j_l}\Delta s_{2,l})^{\alpha_6}_{\alpha_5}\delta^{\alpha_2}_{\alpha_4}\delta^{\alpha_5}_{\alpha_3} h(R_1^m, R_2^n)\Phi^{-1}\Phi^2_{i_m}$$
$$\delta_{i_m j_n}\xi_1'^{i_m}\xi_2'^{j_n}\delta^2(\xi_1^{i_m} - \xi_2^{j_n})\Delta s_{1,m}\Delta s_{2,n} \prod_{k>m} (I + A_{i_k}\xi_1'\Delta s_{1,k})^{\alpha_3}_{\alpha_1} \prod_{l>n} (I + A_{j_l}\xi_2'\Delta s_{2,l})^{\alpha_4}_{\alpha_6}.$$

If we used the $SU(N)$ expression there would be an extra term which did not mix any internal indices. This is how one would get the quadratic term. If we introduce the product $\xi_1'.\xi_2' = \sum_k \xi_1'^k\xi_2'^k\Phi^{-1}\Phi_k^2$ and perform the Lie algebra contractions and rearrange the terms, introduce an auxillary variable θ for the delta function, we get,

$$\{W(\xi_1), W(\xi_2)\} =$$
$$\lim_{\Delta s_1, \Delta s_2 \mapsto 0} \sum_{m,n} \prod_{k<m} (I + A_{i_k}\xi_1'^{i_k}\Delta s_{1,k})^{\alpha_1}_{\alpha_2} \prod_{l<n} (I + A_{j_l}\xi_2'^{j_l}\Delta s_{2,l})^{\alpha_6}_{\alpha_3} h(R_1^m, R_2^n)\Delta s_{1,m}\Delta s_{2,n}$$
$$\int d\theta^1 d\theta^2 \xi_1'.\xi_2'|_\theta \delta^2(\xi_1^i(s_{1,m}) - \theta^i)\delta^2(\xi_2^i(s_{2,n}) - \theta^i)$$
$$\prod_{k>m} (I + A_{i_k}\xi_1'\Delta s_{1,k})^{\alpha_3}_{\alpha_1} \prod_{l>n} (I + A_{j_l}\xi_2'\Delta s_{2,l})^{\alpha_2}_{\alpha_6}.$$

We rearrange and notice that,

$$\lim_{\Delta s_1, \Delta s_2 \mapsto 0} \prod_{k<m} (I + A_{i_k}\xi_1'^{i_k}\Delta s_{1,k})^{\alpha_1}_{\alpha_2}$$
$$\prod_{l>n} (I + A_{j_l}\xi_2'\Delta s_{2,l})^{\alpha_2}_{\alpha_6} \prod_{l<n} (I + A_{j_l}\xi_2'^{j_l}\Delta s_{2,l})^{\alpha_6}_{\alpha_3} \prod_{k>m} (I + A_{i_k}\xi_1'\Delta s_{1,k})^{\alpha_3}_{\alpha_1}.$$

is equal to $W(\xi_1 \circ_\theta \xi_2)$. The remaining terms are nothing but integrals over the parameters;

$$\{W(\xi_1), W(\xi_2)\} =$$
$$\frac{1}{N}\int d\theta^1 d\theta^2 ds_1 ds_2 \delta^2(\xi_1^k(s_1) - \theta^k)\delta^2(\xi_2^k(s_2) - \theta^k) h(R(s_1), R(s_2))\xi_1'.\xi_2' W(\xi_1 \circ_\theta \xi_2).$$

The above derivation can easily be extended to higher dimensions.

7. Appendix-2

Here we give a proof of the Jacobi identity of the Poisson algebra, without using the representation of W in terms of Yang–Mills fields. We will consider a generic situation as is shown in the figure-6. Every "loop" has two intersection pairs with any other one. The generalization to any other situation is clear except it is algebraically complicated. We give the proof without refering to maximal radial extension, but this does not change anything.

Let us look at the Poisson brackets of three "loops";

$$\{W(\xi_1),\{W(\xi_2),W(\xi_3)\}\}+\{W(\xi_2),\{W(\xi_3),W(\xi_1)\}\}+\{W(\xi_3),\{W(\xi_1),W(\xi_2)\}\}.$$

We expand each of the Poisson brackets assuming the generic configuration as in figure-6. We use a condensed notation and drop the explicit appearance of the angular factors in the algebra. Since they only depend on the angular coordinates and they are symmetric functions we can assume that they are attached to the functions $h(R,R')$. This will simplify the writing of the expressions.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\{W(\xi_1),h(R_2^{S_1},R_3^{\bar{S}_1})W(\xi_2\circ_{S_1}\xi_3)+h(R_2^{S_2},R_3^{\bar{S}_2})W(\xi_2\circ_{S_2}\xi_3)\}=\\
&h(R_2^{S_1},R_3^{\bar{S}_1})[h(R_1^{Q_1},R_3^{\bar{Q}_1})W(\xi_1\circ_{Q_1}(\xi_2\circ_{S_1}\xi_3))+h(R_1^{\bar{P}_1},R_2^{P_1})W(\xi_1\circ_{P_1}(\xi_2\circ_{S_1}\xi_3))+\\
&h(R_1^{\bar{P}_2},R_2^{P_2})W(\xi_1\circ_{P_2}(\xi_2\circ_{S_1}\xi_3))+h(R_1^{\bar{Q}_2},R_3^{Q_2})W(\xi_1\circ_{Q_2}(\xi_2\circ_{S_1}\xi_3))]+\\
&h(R_2^{S_2},R_3^{\bar{S}_2})[h(R_1^{Q_1},R_3^{\bar{Q}_1})W(\xi_1\circ_{Q_1}(\xi_2\circ_{S_2}\xi_3))+h(R_1^{\bar{P}_1},R_2^{P_1})W(\xi_1\circ_{P_1}(\xi_2\circ_{S_2}\xi_3))+\\
&h(R_1^{\bar{P}_2},R_2^{P_2})W(\xi_1\circ_{P_2}(\xi_2\circ_{S_2}\xi_3))+h(R_1^{\bar{Q}_2},R_3^{Q_2})W(\xi_1\circ_{Q_2}(\xi_2\circ_{S_1}\xi_3))].
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly for the others,

$$\{W(\xi_2), h(R_3^{\bar{Q}_1}, R_1^{Q_1})W(\xi_3 \circ_{Q_1} \xi_1) + h(R_3^{Q_2}, R_1^{\bar{Q}_2})W(\xi_3 \circ_{Q_2} \xi_1)\} =$$

$$h(R_2^{\bar{Q}_1}, R_1^{Q_1})[h(R_2^{S_1}, R_3^{\bar{S}_1})W(\xi_2 \circ_{S_1} (\xi_3 \circ_{Q_1} \xi_1)) + h(R_2^{P_1}, R_1^{\bar{P}_1})W(\xi_2 \circ_{P_1} (\xi_3 \circ_{Q_1} \xi_1))+$$

$$h(R_2^{P_2}, R_1^{\bar{P}_2})W(\xi_2 \circ_{P_2} (\xi_3 \circ_{Q_1} \xi_1)) + h(R_2^{S_2}, R_3^{\bar{S}_2})W(\xi_2 \circ_{S_2} (\xi_3 \circ_{Q_1} \xi_1))]+$$

$$h(R_3^{Q_2}, R_1^{\bar{Q}_2})[h(R_2^{S_1}, R_3^{\bar{S}_1})W(\xi_2 \circ_{S_1} (\xi_3 \circ_{Q_2} \xi_1)) + h(R_2^{P_1}, R_1^{\bar{P}_1})W(\xi_2 \circ_{P_1} (\xi_3 \circ_{Q_2} \xi_1))+$$

$$h(R_2^{P_2}, R_1^{\bar{P}_2})W(\xi_2 \circ_{P_2} (\xi_3 \circ_{Q_2} \xi_1)) + h(R_2^{S_2}, R_3^{\bar{S}_2})W(\xi_1 \circ_{S_2} (\xi_3 \circ_{Q_2} \xi_1))].$$

$$\{W(\xi_3), h(R_1^{\bar{P}_1}, R_2^{P_1})W(\xi_1 \circ_{P_1} \xi_2) + h(R_1^{\bar{P}_2}, R_2^{P_2})W(\xi_1 \circ_{P_2} \xi_2)\} =$$

$$h(R_1^{\bar{P}_1}, R_2^{P_1})[h(R_3^{\bar{S}_1}, R_1^{S_1})W(\xi_3 \circ_{S_1} (\xi_1 \circ_{P_1} \xi_2)) + h(R_3^{\bar{Q}_1}, R_1^{Q_1})W(\xi_3 \circ_{Q_1} (\xi_1 \circ_{P_1} \xi_2))+$$

$$h(R_3^{Q_2}, R_1^{\bar{Q}_2})W(\xi_3 \circ_{Q_2} (\xi_1 \circ_{P_1} \xi_2)) + h(R_3^{\bar{S}_2}, R_2^{S_2})W(\xi_3 \circ_{S_2} (\xi_1 \circ_{P_1} \xi_2))]+$$

$$h(R_1^{\bar{P}_2}, R_2^{P_2})[h(R_3^{\bar{S}_1}, R_1^{S_1})W(\xi_3 \circ_{S_1} (\xi_1 \circ_{P_2} \xi_2)) + h(R_3^{\bar{Q}_1}, R_1^{Q_1})W(\xi_3 \circ_{Q_1} (\xi_1 \circ_{P_2} \xi_2))+$$

$$h(R_3^{Q_2}, R_1^{\bar{Q}_2})W(\xi_3 \circ_{Q_2} (\xi_1 \circ_{P_2} \xi_2)) + h(R_3^{\bar{S}_2}, R_2^{S_2})W(\xi_3 \circ_{S_2} (\xi_1 \circ_{P_2} \xi_2))].$$

Let us add up these terms and combine the related ones; For $W(\xi_1 \circ_{Q_1} (\xi_2 \circ_{S_1} \xi_3))$

$$h(R_2^{S_1}, R_3^{\bar{S}_1})h(R_1^{Q_1}, R_3^{\bar{Q}_1}) + h(R_3^{\bar{Q}_1}, R_1^{Q_1})h(R_2^{S_1}, R_3^{\bar{S}_1}) = 0.$$

For $W(\xi_1 \circ_{P_1} (\xi_2 \circ_{S_1} \xi_3))$

$$h(R_2^{S_1}, R_3^{\bar{S}_1})h(R_1^{P_1}, R_2^{\bar{P}_1}) + h(R_1^{\bar{P}_1}, R_2^{P_1})h(R_3^{\bar{S}_1}, R_2^{S_1}) = 0.$$

For $W(\xi_1 \circ_{P_2} (\xi_2 \circ_{S_1} \xi_3))$

$$h(R_2^{S_1}, R_3^{\bar{S}_1})h(R_1^{\bar{P}_2}, R_2^{P_2}) + h(R_1^{\bar{P}_2}, R_2^{P_2})h(R_3^{\bar{S}_1}, R_2^{S_1}) = 0.$$

For $W(\xi_1 \circ_{Q_2} (\xi_2 \circ_{S_1} \xi_3))$

$$h(R_3^{\bar{Q}_2}, R_1^{Q_2})h(R_2^{S_1}, R_3^{\bar{S}_1}) + h(R_2^{S_1}, R_3^{\bar{S}_1})h(R_1^{Q_2}, R_3^{\bar{Q}_2}) = 0.$$

For $W(\xi_1 \circ_{Q_1} (\xi_2 \circ_{S_2} \xi_3))$

$$h(R_2^{S_2}, R_3^{\bar{S}_2})h(R_1^{Q_1}, R_3^{\bar{Q}_1}) + h(R_3^{\bar{Q}_1}, R_1^{Q_1})h(R_2^{S_2}, R_3^{\bar{S}_2}) = 0.$$

For $W(\xi_1 \circ_{P_1} (\xi_2 \circ_{S_2} \xi_3))$

$$h(R_2^{S_2}, R_3^{\bar{S}_2})h(R_1^{\bar{P}_1}, R_2^{P_1}) + h(R_1^{\bar{P}_1}, R_2^{P_1})h(R_3^{\bar{S}_2}, R_2^{S_2}) = 0.$$

For $W(\xi_1 \circ_{P_2} (\xi_2 \circ_{S_2} \xi_3))$

$$h(R_2^{S_2}, R_3^{\bar{S}_2})h(R_1^{\bar{P}_2}, R_2^{P_2}) + h(R_1^{\bar{P}_2}, R_2^{P_2})h(R_3^{\bar{S}_2}, R_2^{S_2}) = 0.$$

For $W(\xi_1 \circ_{Q_2} (\xi_2 \circ_{S_2} \xi_3))$

$$h(R_2^{S_2}, R_3^{\bar{S}_2})h(R_1^{\bar{Q}_2}, R_3^{Q_2}) + h(R_3^{Q_2}, R_1^{\bar{Q}_2})h(R_2^{S_2}, R_3^{\bar{S}_2}) = 0.$$

For $W(\xi_2 \circ_{P_1} (\xi_3 \circ_{Q_1} \xi_1))$

$$h(R_3^{\bar{Q}_1}, R_1^{Q_1})h(R_2^{P_1}, R_1^{\bar{P}_1}) + h(R_1^{\bar{P}_1}, R_2^{P_1})h(R_3^{\bar{Q}_1}, R_1^{Q_1}) = 0.$$

For $W(\xi_2 \circ_{P_2} (\xi_3 \circ_{Q_1} \xi_1))$

$$h(R_3^{\bar{Q}_1}, R_1^{Q_1})h(R_2^{P_2}, R_1^{\bar{P}_2}) + h(R_2^{P_2}, R_1^{\bar{P}_2})h(R_1^{Q_1}, R_3^{\bar{Q}_1}) = 0.$$

For $W(\xi_2 \circ_{P_1} (\xi_3 \circ_{Q_2} \xi_1))$

$$h(R_3^{Q_2}, R_1^{\bar{Q}_2})h(R_2^{P_1}, R_1^{\bar{P}_1}) + h(R_1^{\bar{P}_1}, R_2^{P_1})h(R_3^{Q_2}, R_1^{\bar{Q}_2}) = 0.$$

For $W(\xi_2 \circ_{P_2} (\xi_3 \circ_{Q_2} \xi_1))$

$$h(R_3^{Q_2}, R_1^{\bar{Q}_2})h(R_2^{P_2}, R_1^{\bar{P}_2}) + h(R_1^{\bar{P}_2}, R_2^{P_2})h(R_3^{Q_2}, R_1^{\bar{Q}_2}) = 0.$$

Using antisymmetry of the $h(R, R')$ function we get all the above terms zero and essentially even if we do not have the figure, the antisymmetry gives zero. We also used the fact that paranthesis can be removed from products in the calculation of W's keeping the order and product pair the same. One should also note that $W(\xi_1 \circ_Q \xi_2) = W(\xi_2 \circ_Q \xi_1)$

since interchange can be taken as a reparametrization with a discontinuity; and we allow these type of finite discontinuities of the parameter.

8. Appendix-3

In this case we will consider $U(2)$ Mandelstam constraint- which is a cubic relation. We will prove that it is invariant under the action of the Poisson algebra. We will consider a generic case and take a nongeneric intersection just to show that the argument is essentially independent of the way the intersection is assumed. This is shown in figure-7. The generalization to other cases is straightforward.

Let us call the triple intersection points $Q_1Q_2Q_3$ and denote this by Q collectively.

$$W(\xi_1 \circ_Q \xi_2 \circ_Q \xi_3) + W(\xi_1 \circ_Q \xi_3 \circ_Q \xi_2) - W(\xi_1 \circ_Q \xi_2)W(\xi_3) - W(\xi_1 \circ_Q \xi_3)W(\xi_2) -$$
$$W(\xi_3 \circ_Q \xi_2)W(\xi_1) + W(\xi_1)W(\xi_2)W(\xi_3) = 0.$$

Next, we calculate the Poisson bracket of this with ξ_4 and show that the right hand side and the left hand side both give zero. Here is the expansion of each term, we are again using condensed notation of keeping angular factor as part of the antisymmetric function $h(R, R')$;

$$\{W(\xi_4), W(\xi_1)W(\xi_2)W(\xi_3)\} =$$
$$[h(R_4^{P_1}, R_1^{\bar{P}_1})W(\xi_4 \circ_{P_1} \xi_1) + h(R_4^{\bar{P}_2}, R_1^{P_2})W(\xi_4 \circ_{P_2} \xi_1)]W(\xi_2)W(\xi_3) +$$
$$[h(R_4^{\bar{S}_1}, R_2^{S_1})W(\xi_4 \circ_{S_1} \xi_2) + h(R_4^{\bar{S}_2}, R_2^{S_2})W(\xi_4 \circ_{S_2} \xi_2)]W(\xi_1)W(\xi_3) +$$
$$[h(R_4^{T_2}, R_3^{\bar{T}_2})W(\xi_4 \circ_{T_2} \xi_3) + h(R_4^{\bar{T}_1}, R_3^{T_1})W(\xi_4 \circ_{T_1} \xi_3)]W(\xi_1)W(\xi_2).$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&- \{W(\xi_4), W(\xi_1 \circ_Q \xi_2)W(\xi_3) + W(\xi_2 \circ_Q \xi_3)W(\xi_1) + W(\xi_3 \circ_Q \xi_1)W(\xi_2)\} = \\
&- [h(R_4^{P_1}, R_1^{\bar{P}_1})W(\xi_4 \circ_{P_1} \xi_1 \circ_Q \xi_2) + h(R_4^{\bar{S}_1}, R_2^{S_1})W(\xi_4 \circ_{S_1} \xi_1 \circ_Q \xi_2) + \\
&h(R_4^{\bar{S}_2}, R_2^{S_2})W(\xi_4 \circ_{S_2} \xi_1 \circ_Q \xi_2) + h(R_4^{\bar{P}_2}, R_1^{P_2})W(\xi_4 \circ_{P_2} \xi_1 \circ_Q \xi_2)]W(\xi_3) \\
&- [h(R_4^{T_2}, R_3^{\bar{T}_2})W(\xi_4 \circ_{T_2} \xi_3) + h(R_4^{\bar{T}_1}, R_3^{T_1})W(\xi_4 \circ_{T_1} \xi_3)]W(\xi_1 \circ_Q \xi_2) \\
&- [h(R_4^{\bar{S}_1}, R_2^{S_1})W(\xi_4 \circ_{S_1} \xi_2 \circ_Q \xi_3) + h(R_4^{T_2}, R_3^{\bar{T}_2})W(\xi_4 \circ_{T_2} \xi_2 \circ_Q \xi_3) + \\
&h(R_4^{\bar{T}_1}, R_3^{T_1})W(\xi_4 \circ_{T_1} \xi_2 \circ_Q \xi_3) + h(R_4^{\bar{S}_2}, R_2^{S_2})W(\xi_4 \circ_{S_2} \xi_2 \circ_Q \xi_3)]W(\xi_1) \\
&- [h(R_4^{P_1}, R_1^{\bar{P}_1})W(\xi_4 \circ_{P_1} \xi_1) + h(R_4^{\bar{P}_2}, R_1^{P_2})W(\xi_4 \circ_{P_2} \xi_1)]W(\xi_2 \circ_Q \xi_3) \\
&- [h(R_4^{P_1}, R_1^{\bar{P}_1})W(\xi_4 \circ_{P_1} \xi_3 \circ_Q \xi_1) + h(R_4^{\bar{P}_2}, R_1^{P_2})W(\xi_4 \circ_{P_2} \xi_3 \circ_Q \xi_1) + \\
&h(R_4^{T_2}, R_3^{\bar{T}_2})W(\xi_4 \circ_{T_2} \xi_3 \circ_Q \xi_1) + h(R_4^{\bar{T}_1}, R_3^{T_1})W(\xi_4 \circ_{T_1} \xi_3 \circ_Q \xi_1)]W(\xi_2) \\
&- [h(R_4^{\bar{S}_1}, R_2^{S_1})W(\xi_4 \circ_{S_1} \xi_2) + h(R_4^{\bar{S}_2}, R_2^{S_2})W(\xi_4 \circ_{S_2} \xi_2)]W(\xi_3 \circ_Q \xi_1).
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\{W(\xi_4), W(\xi_1 \circ_Q \xi_2 \circ_Q \xi_3) + W(\xi_1 \circ_Q \xi_3 \circ_Q \xi_2)\} = \\
&[h(R_4^{P_1}, R_1^{\bar{P}_1})W(\xi_4 \circ_{P_1} \xi_1 \circ_Q \xi_2 \circ_Q \xi_3) + h(R_4^{\bar{S}_1}, R_2^{S_1})W(\xi_4 \circ_{S_1} \xi_1 \circ_Q \xi_2 \circ_Q \xi_3) + \\
&h(R_4^{\bar{P}_2}, R_1^{P_2})W(\xi_4 \circ_{P_2} \xi_1 \circ_Q \xi_2 \circ_Q \xi_3) + h(R_4^{T_2}, R_3^{\bar{T}_2})W(\xi_4 \circ_{T_2} \xi_1 \circ_Q \xi_2 \circ_Q \xi_3) + \\
&h(R_4^{\bar{T}_1}, R_3^{T_1})W(\xi_4 \circ_{T_1} \xi_1 \circ_Q \xi_2 \circ_Q \xi_3) + h(R_4^{\bar{S}_2}, R_2^{S_2})W(\xi_4 \circ_{S_2} \xi_1 \circ_Q \xi_2 \circ_Q \xi_3)] + \\
&[h(R_4^{P_1}, R_1^{\bar{P}_1})W(\xi_4 \circ_{P_1} \xi_1 \circ_Q \xi_3 \circ_Q \xi_2) + h(R_4^{\bar{S}_1}, R_2^{S_1})W(\xi_4 \circ_{S_1} \xi_1 \circ_Q \xi_3 \circ_Q \xi_2) + \\
&h(R_4^{\bar{P}_2}, R_1^{P_2})W(\xi_4 \circ_{P_2} \xi_1 \circ_Q \xi_3 \circ_Q \xi_2) + h(R_4^{T_2}, R_3^{\bar{T}_2})W(\xi_4 \circ_{T_2} \xi_1 \circ_Q \xi_3 \circ_Q \xi_2) + \\
&h(R_4^{\bar{T}_1}, R_3^{T_1})W(\xi_4 \circ_{T_1} \xi_1 \circ_Q \xi_3 \circ_Q \xi_2) + h(R_4^{\bar{S}_2}, R_2^{S_2})W(\xi_4 \circ_{S_2} \xi_1 \circ_Q \xi_3 \circ_Q \xi_2)].
\end{aligned}
$$

We can combine term by term. The main idea is that the addition of ξ_4 to each "loop" is going to create another "loop" with the same common point of intersection and it has to satisfy the Mandelstam constraint. This gives zero for each such term. We will combine the terms with the coefficient $h(R_4^{P_1}, R_1^{\bar{P}_1})$;

$$
\begin{aligned}
h(R_4^{P_1}, R_1^{\bar{P}_1})[&W(\xi_4 \circ_{P_1} \xi_1)W(\xi_2)W(\xi_1) - W(\xi_4 \circ_{P_1} \xi_1 \circ_Q \xi_2)W(\xi_3) \\
&- W(\xi_4 \circ_{P_1} \xi_1 \circ_Q \xi_3)W(\xi_2) - W(\xi_4 \circ_{P_1} \xi_1)W(\xi_2 \circ_Q \xi_3) + \\
&W(\xi_4 \circ_{P_1} \xi_1 \circ_Q \xi_2 \circ_Q \xi_3) + W(\xi_4 \circ_{P_1} \xi_1 \circ_Q \xi_3 \circ_Q \xi_2)].
\end{aligned}
$$

and the above term is zero because of the Mandelstam constraint for $(\xi_4 \circ_{P_1} \xi_1), \xi_2, \xi_3$ with respect to the intersection Q. We also used the fact that the angular factors attached to them depends only which curve we are on, but not to the specific product.

Acknowledgements We would like to thank A. Ashtekar,S. Guruswamy, R. Henderson and K. Gupta for usefull discussions. Alan Fry kindly helped to prepare the figures. This work was supported in part by the US Department of Energy, Grant No. DE-FG02-91ER40685.

References

1. S. Mandelstam, Phys. Rev. **175** 1580 (1968); Phys. Rev. **D19** 2391 (1979).

2. S.G.Rajeev, Phys. Lett. **B212** 203 (1988).

3. K.G. Gupta, R.J. Henderson, S.G. Rajeev, and O.T. Turgut, Jour. Math. Phys. **35** 3845 (1994)

4. L. Chandar and E. Ercolessi, Nucl. Phys. **B426** 94 (1994).

5. S.G. Rajeev, in Proceedings of the 1991 Summer School in High Energy Physics and Cosmology, ed. E. Gava et. al. World Scientific (1992) p. 955.

6. P. Bedaque, I. Horvath and S. G. Rajeev, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A7** 3347 (1992).

7. S.G. Rajeev, hepth #9401115 to appear in Int. Jour. Mod. Phys.

8. I. Pesando, hep-th 9408018; M. Caviddi, P. di Vecchia and I. Pesando, Mod. Phys. Lett. **A8** 2127(1993).

9. A. Dhar, G. Mandal and S. R. Wadia, Phys. Lett. **B329** 15 (1994); hep-th 9407026.

10. K.S. Gupta, S. Guruswamy, and S.G. Rajeev, Phys. Rev. **D48** 3354 (1993).

11. M. Makeenko and A. A. Migdal, Nucl. Phys. **B188** 269 (1981).

12. R. Giles, Phys. Rev **D24** 2160 (1981).

13. K. Kikkawa, Ann. Phys. **135** 222 (1981).

14. A. Ashtekar,*Lectures on Non-perturbative Canonical Gravity*, Singapore, World Scientific (1991); A. Ashtekar and C. Isham, Class. Quan. Grav. **9** 1433 (1993).

15. S.G. Rajeev, Ann. Phys. **173** 249 (1987).

16. R. J. Perry, Ann. Phys. **232** 116 (1994).

17. V. G. Drin'feld, *Quantum Groups*, ICM Proceedings, Berkeley, 898 (1986).

18. M. Kaku and K. Kikkawa, Phys. Rev. **D10** 1110 (1974); Phys. Rev. **D10** 1823 (1974).

19. R.Penrose and W. Rindler, *Spinors and Space-time*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1986; R. Wald, *General Relativity*, Univ. of Chicago Press, 1984.

20. G. t'Hooft, Nucl. Phys. **B72** 461 (1974).

This figure "fig1-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-th/9410053v1

This figure "fig2-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-th/9410053v1

This figure "fig2-2.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-th/9410053v1

This figure "fig2-3.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-th/9410053v1

This figure "fig2-4.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-th/9410053v1

This figure "fig2-5.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-th/9410053v1

This figure "fig2-6.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/hep-th/9410053v1